

Application No.: 10/534,258  
Amendment dated July 2, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of April 6, 2007

Docket No.: 2346-0111PUS1

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 1-30. These sheets, which include Figures 1-30, replace the original sheets including those same Figures.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (16)

### **REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the through consideration given the present application. Claims 22-41 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner considers the subject matter of claims 24, 25, 31 and 41 as being allowable and the subject matter of claims 28, 37 and 39 as being allowable if re-written in independent form. It is further noted that previously the Examiner included additional claims as being allowable in the previous action. In view of the present amendment, Applicants submit that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance.

### **Information Disclosure Statement**

The Examiner has acknowledged the Information Disclosure Statement filed on January 4, 2007. An initialed copy of the PTO 1449 has been received from the Examiner. No further action is necessary at this time.

### **Drawings**

The Examiner required corrected drawings due to foreign characters in the figures. By way of the present amendment, Applicants are submitting a complete set of substitute drawings with the Figure number indicated in English and with the removal of other foreign characters in Figures 6 and 8. Applicants submit that the drawing correction is now overcome.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 23-25 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner points out several instances of expressions such as “with or without”. By way of the present amendment, Applicants have removed all of these occurrences. Accordingly, this rejection is overcome.

**Claim Objections**

The Examiner objected to claims 38 and 39 and suggest that the phrase “can be” be changed to “being”. Upon review of these claims, Applicants believe that the correct insertion should be “are” which has now been accomplished by way of the present amendment. Accordingly this objection is overcome.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 22, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Saito (U.S. Patent 6,255,994). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

By way of the present amendment, Applicants have amended independent claim 22. Claim 22 now describes a combination of elements including an antenna for multiple bands where one end of an antenna element is connected to a feeding point and the antenna element extends longitudinally from the feeding point to the other end, one ends of switches are connected to the intermediate point and the other end of the antenna element with the intermediate point being a point on the longitudinally extended element, the other end of the

switches stacked into a ground conductor directly and the other end of other switches are connected to the ground conductor with an extension coil or short capacitor so that different electrical lengths from the feeding point by way of the switches are capable and resonant frequencies with different electrical lengths are set not to come close to one of the frequency bands with which electrical length resonates. In particular, Applicants submit that the Saito reference does not disclose that the intermediate point is along a point on the longitudinally extended antenna element. Instead, in Saito, the Examiner has identified the intermediate point as 7a or 9a and is not connected to the longitudinal part of the antenna element. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Saito reference does not disclose every feature of claim 22.

Claims 26, 30 and 32-39 depend from claim 22 and as such are also considered to be allowable.

#### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Saito in view Kuck (U.S. Patent 6,567,047). Claims 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Saito in view of Kojola et al. (U.S. Patent 7,039,437). Claims 32-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Saito in view of Gamalielsson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,388,626). Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Saito in view of Warnagiris et al. (U.S. Patent 5,754,143). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that these rejections are also overcome for similar reasons presented above in regard to claim 22. In particular, claim 23 has been amended in a similar fashion to

Application No.: 10/534,258  
Amendment dated July 2, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of April 6, 2007

Docket No.: 2346-0111PUS1

claim 22. Applicants submit that the combination of elements described in each of these claims is not obvious over the Saito reference either by itself or taken in conjunction with one or more of the other secondary references. Accordingly, these rejections are likewise considered to be overcome.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse, Reg. No. 27,295, at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James M. Slattery

Registration No.: 28,380

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicants

Attachments: Replacement Drawings